UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,847	03/03/2004	Youenn Fablet	01807.101570.	2498

5514   7590   07/20/2010
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
ZAHR, ASHRAF A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/790,847	FABLET, YOUENN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ASHRAF ZAHR	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2010*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9,10,12-14 and 16-24* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☒ Claim(s) *14,18,21 and 24* is/are allowed.
6)☐ Claim(s) *1-6, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, 23* is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) *8* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is the final rejection for application 10/790847. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-14, and

16-24 are pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 14, 18, 21, 24 are allowed.

3.   Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant Argues, "Stawikowski is not seen to disclose "a description of a

processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or a post-processing of

data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the

communication network" since it describes the use of different protocols. In particular,

Stawikowski does not disclose any service which can provide pre or post processing

features to the client in addition to the core processing. As such, Stawikowski is not

seen to disclose any description of services which would contain a description of pre or

post processing features".

         However, it describes the capabilities of one or several WEB services 21, 21' on

automation equipment 10, in other words that .describes the WEB services that

automation equipment 10 is capable of supplying or offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-

45). Furthermore, A service description document 61 specifies a set of requests

(request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5,

ln 65 – col 6, ln 5). The examiner reads this as meeting the limitations and therefore

respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Stawikowski, US 7,159,007 (Hereinafter, Stawikowski) in

view of Dani, et al. US 7,386,860 (Hereinafter, Dani).

Regarding Claim 1, Stawikowski discloses "method of offering a service

provided by a server computer in a communication network comprising sending, from a

server computer that provides a service to a client computer, a service description

document in a language for describing web services". Specifically, the communication

system described in this invention uses a service description document 61 offering

(Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

Stawikowski also discloses "which is independent of any client or user

characteristic, defining the type of data exchanged between said server and any client

when said service is executed". Specifically, that describes the capabilities of one or

several WEB services 21, 21' on automation equipment 10, in other words that

.describes the WEB services that automation equipment 10 is capable of supplying or

offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

Stawikowski also discloses "the service description document comprising a

description defining the type, content and sequencing of data exchanged between said

server and any client when said service is executed". Specifically, a service description

document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of

parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Stawikowski also discloses "and a description of a processing functionality

implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a

message exchanged during the execution of said service on the communication

network".   Specifically, a the service description document 61 is conform with a service

description language referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or HTTPS protocol

and providing grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams defined by the

W3C.) (Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).

Stawikowski also discloses "wherein the description of said processing

functionality comprises a list of properties supported by said processing functionality,

said properties defining at least respectively, the node in the communication network

adapted to execute said processing, and the type of processing". Specifically, a service

description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of

parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Dani also discloses "wherein the description of said processing functionality

comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is

obligatory or optional". Specifically, an optional extensions field (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine Dani with Stawikowski to include optional extensions. The motivation do so

would be to include additional information in the service reference (Dani, col 24, ln 55-

60).

Regarding Claim 2, Stawikowski also discloses "wherein said processing

functionality defines preprocessing or post processing adapted to produce or use data

in XML format defined in a first abstract part of a service description document".

Specifically, a the service description document 61 is conform with a service description

language referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or HTTPS protocol and

providing grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams defined by the W3C.)

(Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).

Regarding Claim 3, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 2,

wherein the description of said processing functionality is inserted in said first abstract

part of the service description document". pecifically, a message representing an

abstract definition of a transmitted data type (for example string, boolean, etc. . . .). A

WSDL binding is conform with the WSDL language and is based on the XML language.

(Stawikowski, col 2, ln 50-55).

Regarding Claim 4, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said preprocessing or said post-processing is implemented via a script

language". Specifically, JAVA servlet, a JSP application, an ASP application, etc. All or

some of this computer application 31 is generated and deployed 52 by means of a

development application 41 (Stawikowski, col 5ln 8-15).

Regarding Claim 5, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said processing functionality description is defined as a data item in XML

format in a first abstract part of a service description document". Specifically, a

message representing an abstract definition of a transmitted data type (for example

string, boolean, etc. . . .). A WSDL binding is conform with the WSDL language and is

based on the XML language. (Stawikowski, col 2, ln 50-55).

Regarding Claim 6, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 5,

wherein said data item in XML format defining said processing functionality description

is encoded in a second concrete part of the service description document". Specifically,

a the service description document 61 is conform with a service description language

referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or HTTPS protocol and providing

grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams defined by the W3C.)

(Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).

Regarding Claim 9, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify the

message or a set of messages to which said preprocessing or post processing applies".

Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request

name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 –

col 6, ln 5).

Regarding Claim 10, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to define the

data produced or used by said preprocessing or post-processing, and possibly the type

of said data". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests

(request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5,

ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Regarding Claim 12, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein, for at least one property supported by said processing functionality, the

description of said processing functionality comprises a list of values attributable to said

property". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests

(request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5,
ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

  Regarding Claim 13, Stawikowski also discloses "method of testing access to a
service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description
document, comprising the following steps implemented by said client computer".
Specifically, the communication system described in this invention uses a service
description document 61 offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

  Stawikowski also discloses "extracting from said service description, provided by
a server computer offering a said service, document a description of a processing
functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML
format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the
communication network". Specifically, a the service description document 61 is conform
with a service description language referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or
HTTPS protocol and providing grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams
defined by the W3C.) (Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).Stawikowski also discloses "reading,
from the extracted description of said processing functionality, a value associated with a
property adapted to specify a node in the communication network adapted to execute
the processing". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of
requests (request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes)
(Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Dani also discloses "reading, from the extracted description of said processing functionality, a value of a property adapted to specify whether the must be executed by the client computer". Specifically, an optional extensions field (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60).

Dani also discloses "verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when said processing is obligatory and must be executed by said client computer in the communication network". Specifically, an optional extensions field (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Dani with Stawikowski to include optional extensions. The motivation do so would be to include additional information in the service reference (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60).

Regarding Claim 16, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 1. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 17, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 13. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Regarding Claim 19, Stawikowski also discloses a "server computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1" (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 9-16).

Regarding Claim 20, Stawikowski also discloses "client computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13" (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 9-16).

Regarding Claim 22, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1". This claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 23, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13". This claim is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ASHRAF ZAHR whose telephone number is (571)270-

1973. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAZ 7/15/10

/William L. Bashore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175